

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	4578	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Humboldt County	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	North Coast Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$954,000

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Develop Phase II of the North Coast IRWMP by identifying water management needs in the North Coast and prioritizing projects for implementation.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 12

Comment: Tasks are described in good detail; however, the schedule lacks detail and the budget is too general to determine if it is realistic. Work items were clearly identified. The IRWMP will include many relevant planning documents and processes to identify and compile. This proposal is for Phase II; Phase I approval is scheduled to be approved in July 2005.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: RWMG is a consortium of six county governments with two governing board representatives designated for policy review group supported by technical staff and consultants at the basin scale and coordinated to the North Coast hydrologic region boundaries. Types of water sources are listed with descriptions of water quality and quantity. Individual source types of water quantities are described by their uses, but no flow amounts were stated nor references cited.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: Regional planning objectives are described as being in conformance with multiple statewide agency priorities derived from: 1) review of agency information; 2) consultation with agency staff and interested members of the public, including project proponents; and 3) policy and technical review planning team member input. The preliminary list of planning objectives included in the proposal application will be addressed, refined, and potentially expanded during the process of IRWMP development.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: A list of water management strategies to be integrated is given with reference as to how they were determined. The applicant states how the selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect and gives examples. All applicable Guideline standards for integration of strategies have been included. Multiple management strategies are set forward, and an adaptive management process has been developed for future development, use, and region-wide implementation of those management strategies.

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: Projects will be identified, prioritized, and scheduled for implementation by the finish of the proposal term in February 2008. The technical and policy management groups will develop a finance plan for the IRWMP implementation under Task 16, bolstered by the matching funds from the Counties. A process to determine a general schedule for implementation is stated and given as Task 9; however, a schedule beyond IRWMP implementation could not be found in the application. A process to develop an institutional structure for implementation is given as Task 9. A process to monitor the performance of the IRWMP is described in Task 10. A process to make changes to the IRWMP is described in Task 5. NPS protocols are identified as part of the existing monitoring protocols to be incorporated into the project status and monitoring process.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 10

Comment: The applicant clearly states that a detailed assessment and analysis of potential impacts within the region and adjacent areas will be performed. A list of potential impacts would be more descriptive. Potential benefits will be analyzed using a screening level assessment for plan components and implementation projects. CEQA compliance is a task in the Work Plan. Furthermore, the applicant states that the planning process will be subject to CEQA review, but each lead agency will be responsible for final CEQA development.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The adequacy of existing data will be difficult to determine until Tasks 3, 4, and 10 are complete. Task 10 will outline and prioritize how data will be integrated into the adaptive management framework of the IRWMP utilizing the standards and protocols identified in Sub-task 4.7. The proposal describes how identified data gaps will be addressed with the deliverable report for Task 10, but no data types or corresponding amounts are given. It is also difficult to determine level of effort needed or planned for studies to be identified in Tasks 4 and 10 due to lack of detail in task narratives and in the budget items.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: The proposal addresses planning and project level data management in Tasks 3, 4, 5, and 10. Specific protocols for use of information gained during IRWMP development and project implementation will be developed under Task 10. Tasks 4 and 5 address planning document information and data collection/management protocols to be collected and incorporated into the IRWMP. Geographic data collection, management, and dissemination will be accomplished in Task 3. Data collected will be distributed to cooperating state agencies.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: Stakeholder involvement would occur under the proposal by development of a IRWMP Conference, the existing Memorandum of Mutual Understanding (MoMU) (79 signatories), a website for information dissemination and coordination, and both routine and focused meetings. The list of signatories to the MoMU is diverse enough to suggest all appropriate stakeholders would be included in the planning process. Six water purveyors are included in the MoMU and four water purveyors are listed as project proponents in Appendices A and B. Environmental justice is listed as a statewide priority to be used as a planning objective.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: A large proportion of the region's population is disadvantaged. The IRWMP Phase I is being developed in partnership with the DACs in the region and will include processes for outreach and the identification of projects to improve water quality, water supply, quality of life, economic opportunity, and maintenance of autonomy for DACs of varying sizes throughout the region. The water supply and quality needs of the DACs are not directly documented in the proposal, but should be addressed during the processes outlined in the proposal. It is stated that consideration of water supply and quality for DACs is incorporated into all proposed projects. Reference to DAC water suppliers struggling to upgrade their facilities to meet state requirements is made.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 4

Comment: There are 232 planning documents listed in Appendix C for consideration in the IRWMP process. However, the applicant does not state which plans/programs will form a foundation for the IRWMP. A good description of the relation and dynamics between local plans and IRWMP is given with reference to corresponding tasks. Local priorities will identify projects for inclusion under the planning proposal. These projects will then be prioritized for implementation under the IRWMP and coordinated with regional and county planning processes using a framework for coordination to be developed in Task 5 of the work plan.

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 5

Comment: A primary purpose of the IRWMP is to develop a cohesive and collaborative framework for attaining local, regional, and statewide objectives related to integrated water management. By including the County Boards of Supervisors, land use planning decision makers will participate and gain updated, detailed, and informed General Plan water resource elements that are designed to be consistent with State and federal agency priorities and water management strategies. Interagency coordination has been extensive to date, and remains the emphasis and an over-riding benefit of this IRWMP effort. The proposal sets forth in detail how this will continue and details how agency coordination processes and institutional structures will be further implemented.

TOTAL SCORE: 82